

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/672,723	<b>Applicant(s)</b> CRAPP ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Michael J. Hicks	<b>Art Unit</b> 2165	

**All Participants:**

(1) Michael J. Hicks.

(2) \_\_\_\_\_

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) Brain Gaffney.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 29 March 2006

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1-97

Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner proposed a restriction of Claims into two groups, Group I consisting of Claims 1-83, and Group II consisting of Claims 84-97. Applicant tentatively agreed to proposed restriction. Applicant then affirmed that the restriction would be accepted without traverse and indicated the election of Group I in a phone message left on 3/30/06.